1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
8						
9						
10	ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,					
11	Plaintiff, No. C 10-03561 WHA					
12	v.					
13	GOOGLE INC., SPECIAL VERDICT FORM					
14	Defendant.					
15						
16	YOUR ANSWER MUST BE UNANIMOUS.					
17	1. As to all the compilable code for the 37 Java API packages in question taken as a					
18	group:					
19	A. Has Oracle proven that Google has infringed the overall structure,					
20	sequence and organization of a copyrighted work owned by Oracle?					
<ul><li>21</li><li>22</li></ul>	Yes No					
23						
24	(IF YOU ANSWER "NO" TO QUESTION 1A, THEN SKIP TO QUESTION NO. 2.)					
25						
26	B. If so, has Google proven that its use of the overall structure,					
27	sequence and organization constituted "fair use"?					
28	Yes No					

Note: The 37 API packages in question are listed in Question No. 2.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 2. As to each of the 37 Java API packages listed below, considered individually:
- Has Oracle proven that Google has infringed the structure, A. sequence and organization of the *compilable code* for each *individual API* package? Please indicate your answer to each in the first column below.
- B. If, in column 1 your answer is "yes," then state in the second column whether or not Google has proven that its use constituted "fair use" (as defined in the instructions). If you answered "no" in column 1, you should leave the second column blank or enter "NA" for "not applicable."
- C. Has Oracle proven that Google copied the documentation for the individual API package? Please indicate your answer as to each in the third column below.
- D. If, in column 3, your answer is "yes," then state in the fourth column whether or not Google has proven that its use constituted "fair use" (as defined in the instructions). If you answered "no" in column 3, you should leave the fourth column blank or enter "NA" for "not applicable."

(IN ANSWERING THE FOUR ABOVE SUB-QUESTIONS, PLEASE REMEMBER THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN "COMPILABLE CODE" AND "DOCUMENTATION," AS DEFINED IN THE INSTRUCTIONS, AS WELL AS THE "WORK AS A WHOLE" ALSO DEFINED IN THE INSTRUCTIONS.)

	COMPILABLE CODE		DOCUMENTATION	
	Copying Proven? (Yes or No)	Fair Use Proven? (Yes, No or NA)	Copying Proven? (Yes or No)	Fair Use Proven? Yes, No or NA)
java.awt.font				
java.beans				
java.io				
java.lang				
java.lang.annotation				
java.lang.ref				

ADIDACKACE

ADIDACKACE

	API PACKAGE COMPILABLE CODE		API PACKAGE DOCUMENTATION	
	Copying Proven? (Yes or No)	Fair Use Proven? (Yes, No or NA)	Copying Proven? (Yes or No)	Fair Use Proven? Yes, No or NA)
java.lang.reflect				
java.net				
java.nio				
java.nio.channels				
java.nio.channels.spi				
java.nio.charset				
java.nio.charset.spi				
java.security				
java.security.acl				
java.security.cert				
java.security.interfaces				
java.security.spec				
java.sql				
java.text				
java.util				
java.util.jar				
java.util.logging				
java.util.prefs				
java.util.regex				
java.util.zip				
javax.crypto				
javax.crypto.interfaces				
javax.crypto.spec				
javax.net				
javax.net.ssl				
javax.security.auth				
javax.security.auth.callback				
javax.security.auth.login				

		API PACKAGE COMPILABLE CODE		API PACKAGE DOCUMENTATION	
		Copying Proven? (Yes or No)	Fair Use Proven? (Yes, No or NA)	Copying Proven? (Yes or No)	Fair Use Proven? Yes, No or NA)
javax.secu	rity.auth.x500				
javax.secu	rity.cert				
javax.sql					
3.	Has Google p	roven that its con-	ceded use in Android	d of the followi	ng items was
de minimis:			Yes	No	
A.	The rangeCheck TimSort.java an ComparableTin	ıd			
В.	Source code in e	eight "Impl.java			
C.	CodeSourceTes	guage comments t.java and storeParametrium			
4.	If you found i	n Questions 1, 2 o	or 3 that Google cop	ied Oracle's wo	orks and that the
copying wa	s not excused by	fair use or de min	nimis, then answer th	e following qu	estions:
	A. Has O	racle proven that	third-party mobile d	evice manufact	urers
nam	ely,	,	,	······································	
	, _		infringed Oracle's o	copyrights by c	opying
	sing Android soft				
	B. If you	answered "yes" t	o 4(A), has Oracle p	roven that Goo	gle
inte	ntionally induced	or materially con	atributed to the third-	party infringen	nent you
	nd in Ouestion No	•			·

C. If you answered "yes" to 4(A), has Oracle proven that Googl	le				
vicariously infringed Oracle's copyrights as a result of the third-party					
infringement you found in Question No. 4(A)?					
Dated:					
FOREPERSON					